DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 326 062 FL 018 980

AUTHOR Lambert, Richard D.
TITLE Language Policy: An International Perspective. NFLC Occasional Papers.
INSTITUTION Johns Hopkins Univ., Washington, DC. National Foreign Language Center.
PUB DATE 90
NOTE 12p.; Keynote address of the Language Policy Group at the International Symposium on Language Learning of the Etats Generaux des Langues (Paris, France, April 1989).
PUB TYPE Viewpoints (120) -- Speeches/Conference Papers (150)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Comparative Analysis; Comparative Education; *Educational Policy; Foreign Countries; Government Role; *Language Role; *Multilingualism; *Political Influences; *Public Policy; Second Language Instruction

ABSTRACT

A discussion of government language policies involving more than one language looks at two policy issues: the teaching of ethnic languages and the teaching of foreign languages. A primary issue in ethnic language policy is the reconciling of competing claims of different language communities, which often represent extralingual competition and conflict among ethnic groups. Such ethnolinguistic relationships may be characterized by the degree of polarity, the status, and the territoriality of the groups. These characteristics in a number of societies around the world, including the United States, are briefly surveyed. While linguistic policy is seen as hostage to ethnic politics, foreign language policy is viewed as involving a different and complex set of decisions by the state. Steps in formulating a national foreign language policy include charting the ways in which the many different activities and organizations engaged in foreign language instruction add up to a de facto national system, determining the extent to which that system serves national needs, resolving discontinuities in the system, determining national goals, and deciding which languages to teach. It is concluded that ethnic and foreign language policies are both separate and interrelated in their effects, and that comparative language policy analysis merits further development. (MSE)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

LANGUAGE POLICY: AN INTERNATIONAL PERSPECTIVE

Richard D. Lambert
National Foreign Language Center

About the Author

Richard D. Lambert is director of the National Foreign Language Center at The Johns Hopkins University in Washington, D.C., professor emeritus of Sociology and South Asian Regional Studies at the University of Pennsylvania, and editor of *The ANNALS of the American Academy of Political and Social Science*. He is author of *Points of Leverage: An Agenda for a National Foundation for International Studies, Beyond Growth: The Next Stage in Language and Area Studies*, and *The Transformation of an Indian Labor Market: The Case of Pune*. Dr. Lambert's most recent book, *International Studies and the Undergraduate*, is the result of a massive two-year survey of undergraduate international education in the United States, conducted for the American Council on Education.

About the *Occasional Papers*

This is the eighth in a series of Occasional Papers published by the National Foreign Language Center (NFLC).

The NFLC prints and distributes as *Occasional Papers* articles on a wide variety of topics related to foreign language research, education, and policy. The papers are read by an internal review committee. The *Occasional Papers* are intended to serve as a vehicle of communication and stimulant for discussion among groups concerned with these topic areas. The views expressed in these papers are the responsibility of the authors and do not necessarily reflect the views of the NFLC or of The Johns Hopkins University.

This paper was presented as the keynote address of the Language Policy Group at the Etats Généraux des Langues International Symposium on Language Learning, Paris, April 1989.

Copyright 1990, The National Foreign Language Center
at The Johns Hopkins University

Language Policy: An International Perspective

RICHARD D. LAMBERT
National Foreign Language Center

National language policy, a broad topic that encompasses phenomena as varied as pidgins and creoles, early language learning, in-company language policy, and the linguistic consequences of the Acte Unique Européen, defies attempts at summary and synthesis. Yet all of these subjects and many more are crammed under a single rubric. I will delimit the topic somewhat by directing my remarks to issues concerning state policy which involve more than one language—what might be called multilanguage policy—leaving aside issues relating to a single language—what might be called unilanguage policy—such as the improvement of pedagogical styles, the spread of literacy, or the purification and maintenance of a standard language.

Within multilanguage policy are two different frames of reference. The first concerns the teaching of languages that are exogenous to the society. The second concerns the teaching of languages used as mother tongues by important segments of the society. The former I will refer to as foreign language policy, and the latter as ethnic language policy as it relates to indigenous diversity. These terms are both a little inexact and overlapping. For instance, French is both ethnic and foreign in Canada, as is English in Hong Kong or Africa. However, the dynamics and the outcome of the two different language policy orientations are quite different. Indeed, in the voluminous literature on language policy they comprise two very different genres. Each article or book, each feature of language policy tends to proceed from one or the other orientation, rarely both. The separation of policy with respect to instruction in Spanish in the United States as a foreign language issue and as an ethnic language issue is a case in point. Another is the difference between the Council of Europe's Recommendation 928 (1981) on the Educational and Cultural Problems of Minority Languages and Dialects in Europe[1] and Recommendation No. R (82) 18 of the Committeé of Ministers to Member States concerning Modern Languages.[2] The first deals primarily with ethnic language policy, the second with foreign language policy. I will deal with the topics in that order.

ETHNIC LANGUAGE POLICY

No aspect of language policy is quite so troublesome, quite so pervasive, and quite so difficult to deal with as the crafting of an acceptable solution to competing claims of champions of different language communities within a society. While from the policy viewpoint these competing claims appear as language issues—which languages will be given official approval, support, and use—their center of gravity lies outside of language in the pattern of institutionalized competition and conflict among ethnic groups. And such conflict, with its implications for language policy, is almost universal.

To illustrate, we need only recall the news accounts of ethnic or racial violence in Lebanon, South Africa, Yugoslavia, China, Armenia, Turkey, Northern Ireland, Sri Lanka, India, the United States, and the Soviet Union. In fact, the longest, most continuous conflict between the same two opponents in the world is an ethnic conflict—the battle between the Tamils and the Sinhalese in Sri Lanka. And if we spread the net a little wider to include not just violent but quieter forms of social conflict, the ubiquity and durability of ethnic competition and conflict are even more apparent.

Not all of these ethnic conflicts involve language. For instance, issues of race relations in the United States, the Protestant-Catholic controversy in Northern Ireland, the Sikh-Hindu controversy in the Punjab, and the neo-Buddhist movement in Maharashtra have little or no

language base. However, most ethnic conflicts do. And even where there is no overt conflict, in many countries the symbolic role of language as a counter in the competition of ethnic groups for relative status brings linguistic issues directly into the political process. Take as examples the bitter battle for the separation of Urdu from Hindi in the drive for the creation of Pakistan, the contrasting fortunes of French in Belgium and Quebec, and the enforcement of the mother tongue policy in South Africa. The linguistic symbols of success in ethnic competition are almost universal: the language used by the head of state, in the legislature, in the courts, in government offices, in government documents, in the armed forces, in the various levels of the educational system, in the printed media, on street signs, etc.

In some cases the linguistic aspects of ethnic relations are expressed in open conflict; in others they are managed peaceably within a political system. How they are managed depends upon the particular configuration of ethnic groups in a society. Many variables must be kept in mind in classifying the relevant ethnolinguistic relationships. Three of those variables are: (1) polarity—the number of important linguistically different groups in the society; (2) status—the extent and nature of the relative social ranking of the groups; and (3) territoriality—the extent to which linguistic groups are rooted in geographically defined domains.

Polarity

The first variation in ethnic configuration that affects official language policy is polarity, the number of socially important ethnic units in a society. The most comfortable situation, of course, is ethnic homogeneity, but relatively few countries have this luxury—only 12 countries are populated by a single ethnic group. Another 25 are more than 90 percent homogeneous. The most common pattern is a dominant majority and one or more sizable minorities for whom linguistic survival is a constant battle. However, the bitterest linguistic conflicts arise in what might be called ethnically binary societies, those that are relatively equally divided between two ethnolingustic groups. Examples of such societies are the English-speaking and French-speaking parts of Canada, the Walloons and the Flemish in Belgium, Greeks and Turks in Cyprus, Tamils and Sinhalese in Sri Lanka, Serbs and Croats in Yugoslavia, and in former times Urdu and Bengali speakers in West and East Pakistan respectively. Tripartite societies such as Switzerland and Singapore have many of the same problems. Linguistic conflicts are extremely difficult to solve in such societies.

In a large percentage of the societies of the world, the population is ethnically divided in a such a way that no one or two groups comprise a majority of the population, and in 40 percent of the countries of the world there are more than five significant ethnic minorities. These "mosaic" societies—for instance, India and many of the countries of Africa—have different problems of linguistic policy. The predominant language policy problem in states with a large number of ethnic languages is the search for a lingua franca and the promotion of its use instead of or alongside local languages. A special variety of mosaic societies comprise the former colonial countries of Africa, where an exogenous language introduced by colonialists serves as a lingua franca for elites, but its spread throughout the society is limited. Historically, linguistic policy in the former colonies depended upon who the colonizers were. The French and the Portuguese were generally in favor of blending the metropolitan and the colonial societies and discouraged the teaching of African languages in schools. The British and the Belgians favored separate development of indigenous populations but encouraged the teaching of indigenous languages, although the British set up an elaborate system of English for elites and those destined to work in or with the European sector. The Germans were in favor of teaching German in schools.[3] No matter what the policy, the diffusion of the colonial language to many sections of the society was never very great. Nonetheless, many of the former colonial countries wind up using the colonial language, at least temporarily, as a neutral common language, but this choice runs counter to a number of local pressures: the need to draw more and more students into the educational system at the primary level and, even more particularly in adult literacy classes, the absence of large numbers of teachers adequately trained in the colonial language; and the nationalistic sentiments that point to the suppression of indigenous cultures. All of these make the continued use of the colonial language as the lingua franca problematic.

The more common case is for ex-colonial countries, as well as many other multilingual countries, to try to establish one of the indigenous languages as a lingua franca. Examples of this are attempts to spread Hindi in India,[4] Swahili in Kenya,[5] and Yoruba in Nigeria.[6] Such attempts inevitably arouse all of the anxieties inherent in ethnic competition and become almost impossible to

implement. The usual solution to the problem is to layer language instruction in the schools so that the medium of instruction in pre- and early primary school is the local ethnic language, and another ethnic language and/or a lingua franca is introduced later, first as an object of study, then as a medium of instruction. The deliberate introduction of the lingua franca into the education system generally starts somewhere between the fourth and sixth year, but the long-term tendency is to retain instruction in the ethnic language at a higher and higher educational level.

Status

Relationships among languages are rarely neutral. There is always a stratification grain to them: one is defined as socially superior to others. Historically, this social superiority was supported by the state: the language of the socially dominant group was the language of the state. This group, as South Africa and other countries of Africa remind us, need not be numerically predominant. It is enough for that group to combine high status with the control of the government.

The state's defense of the dominant language against decay is, of course, the classic posture of dominant language communities throughout history. A contemporary example of language policy in the service of the dominant language is the English-only movement in the United States. In Canadian national language policy, the case of Quebec is a typical struggle to shore up the French language against absorption by dominant English. However, official language policy within the province of Quebec confines the use of English to a narrower and narrower scope, attempting to drive it into a low status. Sometimes a language identified with a dominant group has to be artificially nurtured as in the adoption of Irish Gaelic as the official language of Ireland in spite of the small (3 percent at independence) and diminishing number (less than 1 percent now) in the Irish population who speak Gaelic at home.[7] The battle to elevate the official use of Flemish in Belgium reflects the shift in the relative economic and political importance of Wallonia and Flanders.

While the use of state policy to support a dominant language is characteristic of many societies, in many others governmental policy is officially neutral. However, de facto ethnic language policy in such situations tends to be ambivalent. On the one hand, the state endeavors to defend the social dominance or linguistic purity of a national language—most countries have official or quasi-official organizations for this purpose. On the other, the state defends the rights of ethnic minorities to retain their own languages. Often national linguistic policy alternates in different time periods between the two emphases. Soviet language policy has long displayed this ambivalence between promoting the expansion of Russian as a national language and alternatively promoting and discouraging the use of minority language. Chinese language policy has some of the same inconsistencies in, say, Tibet.

Territoriality

Ethnic pressures tend to dominate national language policy when blood, language, and territory are combined. One example of a territorially rooted ethnolinguistic problem for state policy is what might be called a heartland vs. fringe area linguistic relationship. Historically, as nation-states grew up in Europe, a linguistically homogeneous heartland expanded but never fully absorbed a few outlying linguistically distinct enclaves, creating what might be called the linguistic fringe model of ethnolinguistic relations. The Bretons in France, the Basques between Spain and France, and the Welsh in Great Britain are examples of fringe groups existing at the same level of modernity as the central society but resisting full linguistic absorption. In other cases, such fringe linguistic groups may be thought of as cultural fossils. They often retain premodern life styles: tribal peoples living in inhospitable fringes of modern societies, such as North American and South American Indians, Laplanders, aboriginals in Australia, and mountain, desert and frigid zone dwellers almost everywhere. Such minorities are fighting not only linguistic but cultural absorption as well, and language becomes a major symbol of separate identity.

The ethnolinguistic fringe group problem is only one manifestation of more general issues that arise when differences in language coincide with differences in territory. The problem of dialect differences vs. a standard language is almost always a territorially rooted conflict. In fact, this union of language and geography is so ingrained in our thinking about language policy that it may be useful to juxtapose two situations where the tie of language to territory has historically been quite different. In the United States, with a few exceptions such as the Germans in Wisconsin, the traditional pattern of ethnic politics involves a very limited coincidence of language and territory. Until recently, in America ethnic groups have been geographically dispersed. Their

territorial base was overseas, and they had no homeland within the United States with which they identified. Within the United States, the predominant historical pattern was for linguistically distinct immigrant groups to move into one or another metropolitan entry point, followed by quick geographic dispersal throughout the country. Hence, the United States was able to deal with ethnic minorities as dispersed, not territorially concentrated, interest groups. Except in urban politics, the ethnolinguistic minorities did not capture large politically defined regions. Accordingly, there were few demands for a pluralistic national language policy. In fact, language policy did not figure at all in early debates about the appropriate form of government for the United States.

This lack of territoriality in ethnolinguistic relations is now changing in the United States. The influx and geographic concentration of Hispanic populations in particular regions of the country, especially their approaching numerical predominance in California and Florida, have given rise to a new national debate as to whether official language policy ought to be multilingual rather than monolingual as it is now.

Until recently, the older American pattern of geographically diffused ethnolinguistic relations was different from the predominant pattern in Europe and most of the rest of the world. Most multiethnic societies are partitioned into a number of territorially concentrated linguistic units. Hence, in the creation of the nation-state most national language policies had to deal with territorially defined language communities. In recent years, however, the European pattern has begun to approximate the American model. The influx of immigrant and guest worker communities has introduced into Europe an ethnolinguistic process similar to the traditional American one: initial concentration of linguistic minorities in entry metropolises, then partial diffusion throughout the society. Old European solutions to ethnolinguistic problems that were based on political accommodation to the demands of different geographic units do not work in such situations.

What were those solutions? Where ethnic language policy must deal with territorially defined linguistic units and relatively few important minorities exist within the society, territorial differentiation can be used as part of the political solution. This usually takes the form of some type of consociationalism, that is, a federated system that devolves political power from the center to the linguistically defined constituent territories. Relations among constituent territories are then governed by elaborate rules for division and sharing of power on the part of the different elites. Ethnic language policy is held hostage to the political juggling of ethnic power. So long as the elites remain in power and their accommodations are accepted by the populace, peace can be maintained. In recent years, with the loss of legitimacy of traditional elites and the introduction of popular mobilization models in politics, the consociational solution has broken down.

Moreover, the consociational solution is of limited value in most societies. There are too many ethnolinguistic groups. Forty percent of the countries of the world have five or more significant ethnic groups residing within their borders, too many to allow for a territorially based balance of power among elites. Such multilanguage societies, what I call mosaic societies, have great difficulty in making the consociational model work. However, as yet there is no clear alternative model, although some societies are engaged in interesting experiments. One worth examining is taking place in India, where the number of linguistically distinct groups is immense. Depending on how they are counted, the number of languages can exceed one hundred, of which almost all are territorially based. There are fourteen official languages whose distribution by and large coincides with state boundaries. India has tried to invent a special form of the consociational model in what is known as the three-language formula. In this formula, the major languages are grouped into language families: Indo-Aryan and Dravidian, spoken in the north and the south sections of India. Students in the Hindi-speaking area are to study Hindi, English—the colonial language—and another modern Indian language—preferably a South Indian language. Students in the South are to learn the regional language, English, and Hindi. In ethnopolitical terms this is an attempt to use language affinity to combine many linguistic groups into two large territorially defined units so that a consociational model can be created.

Also interesting is the Soviet Union's formal view of itself as a consociational model with its representative government based upon linguistically homogeneous units. It is the communist party that is to provide the overarching arena for negotiations among the various elites. The past decades, however, have borne witness to the difficulty of sustaining this position in the face of the perception widely shared in the borderland linguistic units that they are in a situation better described as

heartland fringe with its notion of dominant vs. minority languages than in a true consociational society in which all languages are equal.

In summary, the world is looking for new models that will deal with the special problems of societies with different types of polarity, different status gradients, and different combinations of linguistic differentiation and territory. Political peace in many nations depends upon the successful invention of such models.

FOREIGN LANGUAGE POLICY

In dealing with the competing demands of internal linguistic minorities, the government is in a reactive mode, responding to social dynamics that lie in the society. Linguistic policy is hostage to ethnic politics. Foreign language policy, in contrast, involves a different set of decisions by the state. In formulating policy to induce or enable citizens to master languages of other countries, the state is in a proactive policy mode, trying to add to or sustain a national competency in the language(s) of another country. While this may seem a straightforward matter of deciding what foreign languages should be taught in school, if one starts with the point of view that it is adult level competencies in foreign languages that the state is trying to produce, the situation is much more complex.

Here I will sketch in some of the broad domains in which foreign language policy planning must take place. A number of excellent reviews of European foreign language policy are available in the literature.[8] I will add the perspective of the American system, which, with its highly decentralized educational system, lack of centralized administrative control, and relatively low commitment to foreign language instruction, provides an interesting comparative perspective to the situation in Europe. However, many of the categories used by Theo van Els[9] and in the publications emerging from the Council on Europe's Project 12[10] fit the American case and that of other countries as well.

I will confine my remarks to what might be called architecture and teleology rather than instructional style. In the United States and, I believe, elsewhere, many if not most of the problems of foreign language instruction are not the result of poor classroom instructional techniques—a topic to which the profession devotes almost all of its attention—but of ambiguities and inefficiencies in the organization of foreign language instruction and unanswered questions about its purpose that limit the effectiveness of even the most gifted teacher, using the most effective teaching technology, teaching the brightest students. The problems arise not so much in individual classrooms, but in the way the parts fit together and what language instruction is all about.

Planning for a National System

The first step in the formulation of a national foreign language policy is charting the ways in which the many different activities and organizations engaged in foreign language instruction add up to a de facto national system and determining the extent to which that system serves the national needs.[11] This national system is not coterminous with the formal educational system, although that seems to be where the attention of the public and the government is directed. For instance, the National Foreign Language Center is currently trying to map out all parts of the U.S. national system for teaching Japanese and Russian. In doing so, we have discovered three very separate components of our national system: (1) the formal educational system, that is, schools, colleges, and universities; (2) a very substantial network of language training schools serving government employees; and (3) a vast array of commercial language schools that provide instruction for corporate executives, for other occupational use, or for individual adults who may have some nonoccupational reason for learning a language. There is an additional sector that might be called the language service sector—translating, interpreting, communications, information processing and storage, foreign language publishing, testing, teacher and program certification, and the like—that is not engaged in language instruction. I will not deal with these matters here, although they too should be addressed by national foreign language policy. Charting even the three different instructional systems dramatizes several overall policy issues.

Discontinuities among the Systems

First, in U.S. society, and I suspect in others, the three foreign language instructional systems have almost nothing to do with each other. They tend to be entirely separate in such matters as clientele, teaching personnel, curriculum, teaching materials, timing, skill level reached, resources, standards, administration, etc. In the United States, there is very little carryover of skills taught to the learner from one segment to the other, and the different instructional systems usually present the learner with a radical shift in pedagogical style.

While government tends to direct its attention exclusively to the formal educational system, in fact the latter two components, particularly what might be called the informal sector, comprise a substantial portion of the national investment in language instruction and learning. This informal sector plays a significant role in foreign language instruction not only in the United States but in many Western European countries, where television courses aimed at adults, proprietary chains such as Berlitz, Inlingua, or Eurocentres, and corporate, even union, language schools add substantially to national resources for foreign language instruction. The summertime flood of private students to the English coast or to France for language lessons is a major industry, and similar overseas language learning experiences such as those planned for Inlingua must be added in as well.

Surely, a truly national foreign language policy will include this chaotic world of proprietary vendors of foreign language instruction. It should also include any intragovernmental language training facilities as well. It is interesting to note that a survey of this "language industry," particularly its high technology sector, is under way in Europe. Other countries embarking on language policy planning should watch these developments carefully. I know of no inventory of intragovernmental programs to parallel this. And the Americans have only begun to map out the informal and governmental systems.

Goal Orientation

One of the reasons why the government and the proprietary language schools are of interest is that they represent the segment of the national system that provides foreign language competencies for actual, usually immediate, use. The formal educational system is only loosely tied to such use through a general notion of adult utilization of foreign language skills. In various societies, this notion of adult use of foreign languages is of greater or lesser realism. The contrast between Europe and the United States in this regard is quite striking. In Europe the formal educational system can operate on the assumption that a large number of adults will have occasion to utilize a language other than their mother tongue. This presumption means that there need be no debate about implicit goals for language learning. There is, of course, a debate about which languages to offer, but such devices as needs surveys[12] and the emergence of English as the language of international communication influence the choice of languages. However, no matter which languages are chosen, the ubiquity of this presumed need for frequent adult use of foreign languages makes the formal educational system the logical place to deliver this instruction for all citizens.

The American situation is patently different from that in Europe. As a society we are not constantly bombarded by communications in foreign languages, so that the usefulness of foreign language competencies for very general purposes is not self-evident to the American public. Very few of us routinely read literature, listen to the radio, watch television, go to the movies, or speak with friends in other languages. Hence, the overriding feature of foreign language instruction in the United States is that it operates in a climate of very limited utilization of foreign language skills by adults and, as I will note, a limited occupational demand for the linguistic skills of those Americans who do attain foreign language competencies. Overall, we are a devoutly monolingual society, wishing we were linguistically homogeneous internally and expecting, even demanding, that citizens of other countries speak English when they want to communicate with us.

Part of the problem for American foreign language teachers is that foreigners accede to our wishes. The willingness of elites in the rest of the world to learn English is both a boon and a curse to us. Indeed, without that willingness—and it is not likely to last forever—we would not just be economically noncompetitive, we would be out of the game. If Japanese were not so difficult a language to learn, English as the lingua franca might be facing a challenge even now.

Given the prevalence of English abroad and the lack of a tradition of normal adult use of foreign languages in the United States, the implicit rationale for the study of foreign languages in the American setting is weak. Relatively few adult Americans will have an opportunity to use a foreign language skill if they do acquire it in school, and most of them will watch it erode into distant memory as the years go by. In view of this situation, Americans do not share the Europeans' strong cultural assumption that the formal educational system should be permeated by foreign language instruction.

Nor, in spite of our frequent sermons about the danger our English language blinders pose to our international competitiveness, have we convinced many business employers that they should seek out and hire those who have a foreign language competency. It is clear that most American business people, particularly

those managing multinational corporations, do not see foreign language competency as an important attribute for their employees. When they do think they need it, they tend to view language competency as a commodity which they can buy at the appropriate time. It is not viewed as a cumulative skill built up over many years like managerial skills. Hence, the link between business interests and the formal educational system of language instruction is very weak. And what is true for business is also true for most other occupations where one might expect to find an effective demand for foreign language competency.

The European assumption of a diffuse demand for foreign language competency for all educated adults makes unnecessary the search for occupational utilization as a specific motivator of foreign language study. The problem of goals, however, emerges in two other ways. First, the general argument for adult use leads to multiyear requirements that all students must study a foreign language. Many students do not find this argument of future adult use persuasive or relevant to their view of their own future. This becomes increasingly clear as educational systems reach toward universal access and the social class level of the student body extends further down the hierarchy. Thus the rationale of assumed adult use provides very weak motivation for many individual students to learn a foreign language thoroughly. The world's educational systems are full of half-hearted foreign language learners who, in spite of the best efforts of gifted pedagogues, drive the level of instruction and skill acquisition way down for all students.

In the United States, the pressure for foreign language requirements is constantly at war with student apathy and resistance. In general, relatively few students stay with language learning long enough to reach the point of mastery. In both high school and colleges the attrition rate of students in the various levels is both uniform and alarming. Only 50 percent of students enrolled in first-year classes go on to take a second year, and only 50 percent of those in second year classes go on to a third year. In short, the American educational system is teaching a lot of students a little bit of foreign language and relatively few students enough to enable them to use it. One result of this truncated learning system is an emphasis on the cultural broadening features which are presumed to flow from foreign language instruction rather than the attainment of genuinely usable skills.

In other countries, where requirements are universal, student apathy and resistance can lead to debased classroom instruction and low levels of language skills at the end of many years' study. For language teachers, this situation presents a cruel paradox. On the one hand, they know that the mastery of a foreign language requires many years of study, particularly if it is just one component in a curriculum jammed with other subjects. Hence, requiring the learner to invest the necessary time in spite of sagging enthusiasm is deemed necessary. However, the entire process is corrupted by the necessary compromises required to move all students through the system both in the United States and elsewhere in the world. Western countries are not the only ones with this problem. In Japan, for instance, driving large numbers of high school students to learn English when many of them know that they will not gain entrance into the highly selective universities and the international elite is a tedious and unrewarding task.

Which Languages to Teach

The two streams of language policy come together in my final topic. In most countries the demands of ethnic and foreign language policy result in a heavy layering of language learning on students during their school years. At one extreme is the United States, in which neither ethnic nor foreign language policy is much guided by current national needs. Since utilization is not the goal of language learning, it really does not matter what language is learned. The languages studied are a by-product of who the teachers are, and they are overwhelmingly concentrated in a few Western European languages. In the United States in 1986, of total foreign language enrollments of 1,003,234 in college and 4,553,012 in high school, 411,293 college students and 2,334,404 high school students were studying Spanish; 275,338 and 1,133,725 were studying French; and 121,022 and 312,162 were studying German in college and high school respectively. In all the other languages 195,591 students were enrolled in college classes and 772,721 in high school classes. At first glance, the dominance of Spanish as the language of first choice by students might appear to be driven by the large and increasing Hispanic minority in the United States. This, in fact, plays a very small role. To a greater extent it is a testimonial to low motivation for language learning. Much more important to heavy enrollment is the general belief among students that Spanish is easier to learn than French and certainly easier than German. Moreover, there is little rational guidance in the selection of languages to be found in the concerns of American

foreign policy. In terms of relevance of foreign language competencies to the future foreign relations of the United States, the current distribution of foreign language enrollments makes little sense.

Language policy in most European countries does not deal with the choice of a single foreign language—more and more it tends to be English—but debate centers on the second and the third languages to be studied and varies by level of education. Here are a few examples in different countries:

> ***Belgium.*** Children in primary school learn one official language [Dutch, French, or German] besides their own. At secondary school they can learn three languages, depending on the type of school.
>
> ***Federal Republic of Germany.*** The arrangements differ in various Lander. In general, pupils learn one foreign language in Hauptschule, two at Realschule, with the option of the third at Gynmasium.
>
> ***Luxembourg.*** The medium of instruction at primary school is initially Luxembourgish. German is taught from the first year and French from the second year. Within a short period of time most subjects are taught in German. Almost half of the teaching periods in primary shool are devoted to the three official languages.
>
> In the first year of general secondary school, pupils continue to learn French and German. In the second year they choose between the modern stream (which includes English) and the classical stream (which includes Latin from the second year and English from the third).
>
> In the second phase, pupils in the language stream continue with French, German and English and take up Italian and Spanish in addition. In secondary education, French gradually replaces German as the medium of instruction.[13]

This heavy load of language learning is mindboggling to an American.

The passages illustrate the mixture of ethnic and foreign language considerations in the setting of language policy in Europe. The determination of which languages to offer or require is usually settled in an additive fashion, that is, both ethnic and foreign language demands are met. The policy in Luxembourg is the purest example of that mixture. In addition, with the emergence of English as a world language, educational systems must either displace or add on to their traditional language learning requirements. Many do both with an unknown but undoubtedly substantial cost in student motivation.

The pressures for the addition of what might be called fringe languages differ in the two continents as well. In Europe, driven by the need to expand linguistic talents more evenly throughout the European Community, the fringe languages tend to be the languages of countries on the southern flank of Europe—Spanish, Italian, and Greek—and perhaps one or another of the immigrant or guest worker languages. What are sometimes called in Europe "the little languages"—that is, non-European languages such as Japanese, Chinese, and Arabic,—tend to be confined to specialized learners at the university level. In the United States, the greatest expansion is taking place in some of these languages. Japanese, for instance, is undergoing a massive expansion. Enrollments have tripled in the last three years, and many more high schools are offering instruction in that language.

In this paper I have been able to cover only a few of the factors influencing language policy. I have stressed both the separate and the interlocking effects of ethnic and foreign language decision making. I hope that further transnational examination of these and other cross-cutting issues will contribute to the further development of the discipline of comparative language policy analysis.

Notes

1 Council of Europe, Report of the Committee on Culture and Education, Assembly Debate on 7 October 1981 (18th sitting), Document 4745.

2 Adopted by the Committee of Ministers on 24 September 1983 at the 350th meeting of the Ministers' Deputies of the Council of Europe.

3 J. Spencer, "Colonial Language Policies and Their Legacies," in T.A. Sebeok, ed., Linguistics in Sub-Sahara Africa, Current Trends in Linguistics, vol. 7 (The Hague: Mouton, 1971): 537-47.

4 Government of India, National Policy on Education (1986).

5 Diana Crampton, "Language Policy in Kenya," Rassegna Italiana di Linguistica Applicata 13, no. 3 (September-December 1986): 109-21.

6 Ayo Bogambose, "Education in Indigenous Languages: The West African Model of Language Education," Journal of Negro Education 52, no. 1 (1983): 57-64.

7 Ralph Fasold, "What National Languages Are For," FL 016239 (Washington, D.C.: ERIC, July 1985).

8 See, for instance, Theo van Els and Guus Extra, "Foreign and second language teaching in Western Europe: A comparative overview of needs, objectives and policies," International Yearbook of European Sociolinguistics (Tubingen, 1987): 100-25.

9 Theo van Els, "Toward a foreign language teaching policy in the European community: A Dutch perspective," Language, Culture and Curriculum 1, no. 1 (1988): 53-65.

10 D. Girard and J. Trim, eds., Project 12: Learning and teaching modern languages for communication: Final report of the project group (Activities 1982-87) (Strasbourg: Council for Cultural Cooperation of the Council of Europe, 1988).

11 A description of the American system is these terms is contained in Richard D. Lambert, The National Foreign Language System, NFLC Occasional Papers (National Foreign Language Center, June 1989).

12 See Theo van Els and Marie Oud de-Glas, eds., Research into Language Needs (Augsburg: Universitat, 1983) and R. Ricterich, Case Studies in Identifying Language Needs (London: Pergamon, 1983).

13 M.C. Holscher, "Foreign languages in secondary education: Policy on foreign languages in secondary education in the European Community and Scandinavia" (Strasbourg: Council of Europe, 1988).

END

U.S. Dept. of Education

Office of Education
Research and
Improvement (OERI)

ERIC

Date Filmed

March 29, 1991